

1 Randall J. Sunshine (SBN 137363)  
rsunshine@linerlaw.com  
2 Ryan E. Hatch (SBN 235577)  
rhatch@linerlaw.com  
3 Jason L. Haas (SBN 217290)  
jhaas@linerlaw.com  
4 LINER LLP  
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
5 Los Angeles, California 90024.3503  
Telephone: (310) 500-3500  
6 Facsimile: (310) 500-3501

**7 | Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
SIGNAL IP, INC.**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 SIGNAL IP, INC., a California  
12 corporation,

Plaintiff,

14 vs.  
15 FORD MOTOR COMPANY, a  
Delaware corporation

Defendant.

Case No. 14-cv-3106

# COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

## **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

18 Plaintiff Signal IP, Inc. (“Signal IP” or “Plaintiff”) brings this Complaint  
19 against Defendant Ford Motor Company (“Ford” or “Defendant”), alleging as  
20 follows:

## PARTIES

22 1. Plaintiff Signal IP is a California corporation with its principal place of  
23 business at 11100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 380, Los Angeles, CA 90025.

24        2.     On information and belief, Defendant Ford Motor Company is a  
25     Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 1 American Road,  
26     Dearborn, MI 48126.

## **JURISDICTION, VENUE AND JOINDER**

**28** 3. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of

1 the United States Code. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28  
2 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

3       4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant. Defendant has  
4 conducted extensive commercial activities and continues to conduct extensive  
5 commercial activities within the State of California. Defendant is registered to do  
6 business in California. Additionally, on information and belief, Defendant, directly  
7 and/or through intermediaries (including Defendant's entities, subsidiaries,  
8 distributors, sales agents, partners and others), distributes, offers for sale, sells,  
9 and/or advertises their products (including but not limited to the products and  
10 services that are accused of infringement in this lawsuit) in the United States, in the  
11 State of California, and in this judicial district, under the "Ford", "Lincoln" and  
12 "Mercury" brand names. Defendant has purposefully and voluntarily placed one or  
13 more of their infringing products and services into the stream of commerce with the  
14 expectation that the products and services will be purchased or used by customers in  
15 California and within this judicial district. Accordingly, Defendant has infringed  
16 Signal IP's patents within the State of California and in this judicial district as  
17 alleged in more detail below.

**18** || 5. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b).

## **BACKGROUND**

20        6.      Signal IP, Inc. is a California corporation with a principal place of  
21 business at 11100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 380, Los Angeles, CA 90025. It is the  
22 owner of the entire right, title and interest in and to U.S. Patent Nos. 5,714,927;  
23 5,732,375; 6,434,486; 6,775,601; 6,012,007; and 5,463,374 (the “Patents-in-Suit”).

24        7.     On information and belief, Defendant is an American car manufacturer  
25 and distributor, which is headquartered in Dearborn, Michigan. Ford manufactures  
26 and distributes cars under the “Ford”, “Lincoln” and “Mercury” brand names.

**LINER**  
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90024, 3505

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**(Infringement of the '927 Patent)**

8. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 7 of this complaint as if set forth in full herein.

9. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to U.S. Patent No. 5,714,927 (the '927 Patent), entitled "Method of Improving Zone of Coverage Response of Automotive Radar." The '927 Patent was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on February 3, 1998. A true and correct copy of the '927 Patent is attached as Exhibit A.

10. Defendant has directly infringed and continues to infringe, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '927 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '927 Patent, including but not limited to the Blind Spot Information System (BLIS), used in products including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge, Escape, Expedition, Explorer, F-Series, Flex, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus, Crown Victoria, Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ, and MKZ Hybrid.

11. Defendant has contributorily infringed and is currently contributorily infringing the '927 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '927 Patent, including but not limited to the Blind Spot Information System (BLIS), used in products including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge, Escape, Expedition, Explorer, F-Series, Flex, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus, Crown Victoria, Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ, and MKZ Hybrid.

12. Defendant has actively induced and is actively inducing the infringement of the '927 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '927

1 Patent, including but not limited to the Blind Spot Information System (BLIS), used  
2 in products including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge, Escape, Expedition,  
3 Explorer, F-Series, Flex, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus, Crown Victoria, Escape  
4 Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX,  
5 MKZ, and MKZ Hybrid.

6        13. Defendant's infringement of the '927 Patent has been and continues to  
7 be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285.

8        14. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendant will continue to infringe the  
9 '927 Patent.

10        15. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff  
11 has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no  
12 adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction  
13 issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

## SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

## **(Infringement of the '375 Patent)**

16. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 15 of this complaint as if set  
forth in full herein.

17. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to  
U.S. Patent No. 5,732,375 (the ‘375 Patent), entitled “Method of Inhibiting or  
Allowing Airbag Deployment.” The ‘375 Patent was duly and legally issued by the  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 24, 1998. A true and correct copy of  
the ‘375 Patent is attached as Exhibit B.

23        18. Defendant has directly infringed and continues to infringe, literally  
24 and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '375 Patent by making, using, offering  
25 for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and  
26 claimed in the '375 Patent, including but not limited to the Personal Safety System,  
27 used in products including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge, Expedition,  
28 Explorer, Fiesta, Flex, Fusion, Escape Hybrid, and Fusion Hybrid, and the Lincoln

**1** MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ, Navigator, Town Car, Mark LT, and MKZ Hybrid.

2        19. Defendant has contributorily infringed and is currently contributorily  
3 infringing the '375 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the  
4 United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '375 Patent,  
5 including but not limited to the Personal Safety System, used in products including  
6 but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge, Expedition, Explorer, Fiesta, Flex, Fusion,  
7 Escape Hybrid, and Fusion Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ,  
8 Navigator, Town Car, Mark LT, and MKZ Hybrid.

9        20. Defendant has actively induced and is actively inducing the  
10 infringement of the '375 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in  
11 the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '375  
12 Patent, including but not limited to the Personal Safety System, used in products  
13 including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge, Expedition, Explorer, Fiesta,  
14 Flex, Fusion, Escape Hybrid, and Fusion Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT,  
15 MKX, MKZ, Navigator, Town Car, Mark LT, and MKZ Hybrid.

16        21.    Defendant's infringement of the '375 Patent has been and continues to  
17 be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285.

18        22. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendant will continue to infringe the  
19 '375 Patent.

20        23. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff  
21 has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no  
22 adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction  
23 issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

## **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

## **(Infringement of the '486 Patent)**

26 | 24. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 23 of this complaint as if set  
27 | forth in full herein.

28 25. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to

1 U.S. Patent No. 6,434,486 (the ‘486 Patent), entitled “Technique for Limiting the  
2 Range of an Object Sensing System in a Vehicle.” The ‘486 Patent duly and legally  
3 issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on August 13, 2002. A true and  
4 correct copy of the ‘486 Patent is attached as Exhibit C.

5 26. Defendant has directly infringed and continues to infringe, literally  
6 and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, the ‘486 Patent by making, using, offering  
7 for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and  
8 claimed in the ‘486 Patent, including but not limited to collision prevention or  
9 avoidance systems, including but not limited to the Adaptive Cruise Control and  
10 Active Park Assist systems, used in products including but not limited to the Ford  
11 C-Max, Edge, Escape, Explorer, Fiesta, Flex, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus,  
12 Ranger, Freestyle and Taurus X, Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max Hybrid,  
13 and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ, Navigator, Mark LT, and MKZ Hybrid.

14 27. Defendant has contributorily infringed and is currently contributorily  
15 infringing the ‘486 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the  
16 United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the ‘486 Patent,  
17 including but not limited to collision prevention or avoidance systems, including but  
18 not limited to the Adaptive Cruise Control and Active Park Assist systems, used in  
19 products including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge, Escape, Explorer,  
20 Fiesta, Flex, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus, Ranger, Freestyle and Taurus X,  
21 Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT,  
22 MKX, MKZ, Navigator, Mark LT, and MKZ Hybrid.

23 28. Defendant has actively induced and is actively inducing the  
24 infringement of the ‘486 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in  
25 the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the ‘486  
26 Patent, including but not limited to collision prevention or avoidance systems,  
27 including but not limited to the Adaptive Cruise Control and Active Park Assist  
28 systems, used in products including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge,

LINER  
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90024, 3505

1 Escape, Explorer, Fiesta, Flex, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus, Ranger, Freestyle  
2 and Taurus X, Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max Hybrid, and the Lincoln  
3 MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ, Navigator, Mark LT, and MKZ Hybrid.

4 29. Defendant's infringement of the '486 Patent has been and continues to  
5 be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285.

6       30. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendant will continue to infringe the  
7 '486 Patent.

8        31. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff  
9 has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no  
10 adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction  
11 issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

## **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

## **(Infringement of the '601 Patent)**

14 | 32. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 31 of this complaint as if set  
15 | forth in full herein.

16        33. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to  
17 U.S. Patent No. 6,775,601 (the ‘601 Patent), entitled “Method and Control System  
18 for Controlling Propulsion in a Hybrid Vehicle.” The ‘601 Patent was duly and  
19 legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on August 10, 2004. A true  
20 and correct copy of the ‘601 Patent is attached as Exhibit D.

21        34. Defendant has directly infringed and continues to infringe, literally  
22 and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '601 Patent by making, using, offering  
23 for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems for hybrid  
24 vehicles disclosed and claimed in the '601 Patent, including but not limited to the  
25 Ford Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max Hybrid, Lincoln MKZ Hybrid, and  
26 Mercury Mariner Hybrid and Milan Hybrid.

27        35. Defendant has contributorily infringed and is currently contributorily  
28 infringing the ‘601 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the

1 United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the ‘601 Patent,  
2 including but not limited to the Ford Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max  
3 Hybrid, Lincoln MKZ Hybrid, and Mercury Mariner Hybrid and Milan Hybrid.

4        36.    Defendant has actively induced and is actively inducing the  
5 infringement of the ‘601 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in  
6 the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the ‘601  
7 Patent, including but not limited to the Ford Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-  
8 Max Hybrid, Lincoln MKZ Hybrid, and Mercury Mariner Hybrid and Milan Hybrid.

9        37. Defendant's infringement of the '601 Patent has been and continues to  
10 be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285.

11        38. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendant will continue to infringe on  
12 the '601 Patent.

13       39. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff  
14 has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no  
15 adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction  
16 issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

## **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

## **(Infringement of the ‘007 Patent)**

19 | 40. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 39 of this complaint as if set  
20 | forth in full herein.

21       41. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to  
22 U.S. Patent No. 6,012,007 (the ‘007 Patent), entitled “Occupant Detection Method  
23 and Apparatus for Air Bag System.” The ‘007 Patent was duly and legally issued by  
24 the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on January 4, 2000. A true and correct copy  
25 of the ‘007 Patent is attached as Exhibit E.

26        42. Defendant has directly infringed and continues to infringe, literally  
27 and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '007 Patent by making, using, offering  
28 for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and

1 claimed in the '007 Patent, including but not limited to the Occupant Classification  
2 System, used in products including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge,  
3 Escape, Expedition, Explorer, F-Series, Fiesta, Flex, Focus, Fusion, Mustang,  
4 Taurus, Crown Victoria, Ranger, E-Series, Freestyle and Taurus X, Transit, Escape  
5 Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX,  
6 MKZ, Navigator, Mark LT, and MKZ Hybrid.

7       43. Defendant has contributorily infringed and is currently contributorily  
8 infringing the '007 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the  
9 United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '007 Patent,  
10 including but not limited to the Occupant Classification System, used in products  
11 including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge, Escape, Expedition, Explorer, F-  
12 Series, Fiesta, Flex, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus, Crown Victoria, Ranger, E-  
13 Series, Freestyle and Taurus X, Transit, Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid, and C-Max  
14 Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ, Navigator, Mark LT, and MKZ  
15 Hybrid.

16       44. Defendant has actively induced and is actively inducing the  
17 infringement of the '007 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in  
18 the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '007  
19 Patent, including but not limited to the Occupant Classification System, used in  
20 products including but not limited to the Ford C-Max, Edge, Escape, Expedition,  
21 Explorer, F-Series, Fiesta, Flex, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus, Crown Victoria,  
22 Ranger, E-Series, Freestyle and Taurus X, Transit, Escape Hybrid, Fusion Hybrid,  
23 and C-Max Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ, Navigator, Mark  
24 LT, and MKZ Hybrid.

25       45. Defendant's infringement of the '007 Patent has been and continues to  
26 be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285.

27       46. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendant will continue to infringe on  
28 the '007 Patent.

1       47. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff  
2 has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no  
3 adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction  
4 issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

## **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

## **(Infringement of the '374 Patent)**

7       48. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 47 of this complaint as if set  
8 forth in full herein.

9        49.    Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to  
10    U.S. Patent No. 5,463,374 (the ‘374 Patent), entitled “Method and Apparatus for  
11    Tire Pressure Monitoring and for Shared Keyless Entry Control.” The ‘374 Patent  
12    was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 31,  
13    1995. A true and correct copy of the ‘374 Patent is attached as Exhibit F.

14        50.    Defendant has directly infringed, literally and/or under the doctrine of  
15 equivalents, the '374 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the  
16 United States certain methods or systems for vehicles disclosed and claimed in the  
17 '374 Patent, including but not limited to the integrated Remote Keyless Entry (RKE)  
18 and Tire Pressure Monitor Systems (TPMS), used in products including but not  
19 limited to the Ford Edge, Escape, Explorer, F-Series, Focus, Fusion, Mustang,  
20 Taurus, E-Series, Freestyle and Taurus X, Escape Hybrid, and Fusion Hybrid, and  
21 the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ, Navigator, and MKZ Hybrid.

22        51.    Defendant has contributorily infringed the ‘374 Patent by making,  
23 using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or  
24 systems disclosed and claimed in the ‘374 Patent, including but not limited to the  
25 integrated Remote Keyless Entry (RKE) and Tire Pressure Monitor Systems  
26 (TPMS), used in products including but not limited to the Ford Edge, Escape,  
27 Explorer, F-Series, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus, E-Series, Freestyle and Taurus  
28 X, Escape Hybrid, and Fusion Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ,

## 1 Navigator, and MKZ Hybrid.

2        52.    Defendant has actively induced infringement of the '374 Patent by  
3 making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods  
4 or systems disclosed and claimed in the '374 Patent, including but not limited to the  
5 integrated Remote Keyless Entry (RKE) and Tire Pressure Monitor Systems  
6 (TPMS), used in products including but not limited to the Ford Edge, Escape,  
7 Explorer, F-Series, Focus, Fusion, Mustang, Taurus, E-Series, Freestyle and Taurus  
8 X, Escape Hybrid, and Fusion Hybrid, and the Lincoln MKS, MKT, MKX, MKZ,  
9 Navigator, and MKZ Hybrid.

10        53. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has  
11 suffered irreparable injury for which it has no adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also  
12 has been damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

14 | Wherefore, Signal IP respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment  
15 | against Defendant as follows:

16 1. That Defendant has directly infringed the Patents-in-Suit;

17 2. That Defendant has contributorily infringed the Patents-in-Suit;

18 3. That Defendant has induced the infringement of the Patents-in-Suit;

19 4. That Defendant's infringement be adjudged willful and deliberate;

20 5. That Defendant and its affiliates, subsidiaries, officers, directors,

21 employees, agents, representatives, successors, assigns, and all those acting in

22 concert, participation, or privity with them or on their behalf, including customers,

23 be enjoined from infringing, inducing others to infringe or contributing to the

24 infringement of the Patents-in-Suit;

25        6. For damages, according to proof, for Defendant's infringement,  
26 together with pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as allowed by law and that  
27 such damages be trebled as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 284;

28 7. That this Court determine that this is an exceptional case under 35

1 U.S.C. § 285 and an award of attorneys' fees and costs to Signal IP is warranted;  
2 and

3 8. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.  
4

5 Dated: April 23, 2014 LINER LLP

6

7 By: /s/ Ryan E. Hatch

8 Randall J. Sunshine

9 Ryan E. Hatch

10 Jason L. Haas

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff, SIGNAL IP, INC.

12 LINER  
13 1100 Glendon Avenue, 14th Floor  
14 Los Angeles, California 90024-3505

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 JURY DEMAND

2 Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 38(b), Plaintiff Signal  
3 IP, Inc. respectfully demands a jury trial on any and all issues triable as of right  
4 by a jury in this action.

5 Dated: April 23, 2014

6 LINER LLP

7

8 By: /s/ Ryan E. Hatch

9 Randall J. Sunshine

10 Ryan E. Hatch

11 Jason L. Haas

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff, SIGNAL IP, INC.

13 LINER  
14 1100 Glendon Avenue, 14th Floor  
15 Los Angeles, California 90024, 3505  
16

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28